

opposition. We were elected the same year, and will be leaving together when our terms expire early in 1997, and I wish him well. The people of Nebraska have had a true friend in Senator JIM EXON.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PAUL SIMON

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, we in the Senate—and the Nation—were saddened to hear that our colleague PAUL SIMON would not seek reelection this year. As a national figure who truly embodies integrity, respectability, and character, Senator SIMON will certainly be missed here.

PAUL SIMON was one of the first politicians to disclose his personal finances so that they would be open to scrutiny by the public. He has firmly supported a balanced budget amendment in order to prevent the Government from continuing to spend itself into greater debt. He has been the Democratic standard bearer on the balanced budget amendment legislation, and I am still hopeful that we see it become a reality before we both leave in early 1997. In the same vein, he has supported a line-item veto for the President to allow the Chief Executive to trim fat from the budget. Senator SIMON recognizes that the Founding Fathers did not intend for the Government to operate in the red.

I think that Senator SIMON's strong commitment to integrity in Government can be traced to his roots in the newspaper business. At the age of 19, he bought his own newspaper, the Troy Tribune. As its publisher, he crusaded against local gangsters who had subverted local law and order. His success in running his own newspaper no doubt influenced his belief in the ability of the Government to operate in a thrifty and effective manner while maintaining the same honesty that he had shown in running his paper.

The business flourished, expanding to 14 papers. Then he decided to sell his interest so that he could devote himself full time to serving his country through Government service. We will always remember the candor, wit, and knowledge he brought to the 1988 Presidential race.

It has been my personal privilege and pleasure to have served on the Senate Judiciary Committee with him. He is not a lawyer, but his keen insight into the legal issues that affect real people is enlightening and instructive. He is an outstanding member of that committee.

This body will be a decidedly lesser place without PAUL SIMON. We congratulate him and will wish him well after he leaves.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak up to 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IMMIGRATION EDUCATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in a few moments the House and Senate conference committee on the immigration bill will meet, and I believe we will approve far-reaching reform on immigration by striking out the so-called Gallegly amendment, which allows the States to deny public education to children who are not legally present in the United States.

The Gallegly amendment, Mr. President, is fundamentally unfair because it is directed at children. It is my view that the children ought to have an opportunity for education for many reasons. One reason is that if they are to be self-supporting adults, if they are to have an acceptable quality of life and become good citizens or residents of the United States of America, they need an education. Second, if they are not in school, they are going to be on the street, and there will be problems of delinquency, there will be problems of juvenile crime.

The answer is not to exclude illegal alien children from having an education, but instead to tighten up the restrictions on illegal immigration and to protect our borders. The immigration bill which is now pending in the House-Senate conference will be a significant step forward in reform, to reform the immigration laws, to protect U.S. borders, to provide for expeditious treatment of immigrants who are illegally in the United States, to deport those immigrants in accordance with our laws.

It is said that the education of illegal alien children is a magnet to draw illegal immigrants into the United States. The answer is not to exclude those children from education, but the answer is to protect American borders so that the illegal immigrants do not gain access to the United States, do not enter the United States, and that children are not here, posing a significant problem in terms of their conduct on delinquency and crime and in terms of their conduct when they grow to adults, assuming they stay in the United States.

There have been those who say that it ought to be the financial responsibility of the Federal Government to pay the cost of education, and I am in agreement with that principle, Mr. President. It has been a failure of the Federal Government to protect U.S. borders. I think it is fair to respond that it ought to be the obligation of the Federal Government to pay to educate the illegal alien children that it has allowed to enter. However, the answer is not to deny those children education while they are in the United States.

Mr. President, I believe it is very important to make sharp distinctions as to how we treat children of illegal immigrants from how we deal with the problem of illegal immigration generally. The way to deal with the problem of illegal immigration is to protect our borders. It is not to deny education

to children once they are in the United States. Neither is it sound, sensible, or fair to deny citizenship to children who are born in the United States to immigrants who have illegal status. The hallmark of America, the hallmark of the Statue of Liberty, and the hallmark of the melting pot is to respect the status of American citizenship of any child born in the United States.

That is a matter, Mr. President, that I feel particularly strong about since both of my parents were immigrants. They both came to the United States legally; that is, to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief they came legally. My father came from Ukraine in 1911—literally walked across Europe, sailed at the bottom of the boat, in steerage, to come to America to find an opportunity for himself and his children. Harry Specter, my father, didn't know that he had a round-trip ticket when he came here—not back to Ukraine but to France, and not back to Paris and the Folies Bergere, but to the Argonne Forest, where he served in the American expedition forces to make the world safe for democracy, with shrapnel in his legs until the day he died.

My mother came with her family as a child of 5 from a small town on the Russian-Polish border, I believe with legal immigrant status, although I would be hard pressed to prove that my parents were legal immigrants if someone were to challenge the status of ARLEN SPECTER as a citizen of the United States.

But when we deal with the problem of illegal immigration, or legal immigration, we have to have a very, very sharp focus on what is appropriate public policy. The bill in its final form, in my judgment, is somewhat too harsh in taking away benefits from legal immigrants and denying some benefits to other immigrants. But I think reform is necessary, and the compromise that has been worked out is a reasonably good compromise, and if we find problems, we can correct them at a later date.

But I want to repeat that it is obnoxious, unfair, and un-American to deny U.S. citizenship to anyone born in this country, no matter what their status. I am glad that the bill before us does not incorporate this proposal.

The conference report has been held up for a very protracted period of time over the Gallegly amendment because there is so much sentiment in the Congress that we ought not to deny education to children regardless of their immigration status. There has been the threat of a veto from the White House. But I think it is highly unlikely that the conference report could pass the Senate with the Gallegly amendment in it.

There has been an effort by a variety of amendments to grandfather children so that once they are in school, they can complete the 6th grade and elementary school or complete high school. There was an amendment which

I had suggested, which I was not really fond of and didn't really think was the ultimate solution but a stop-gap measure, to have a mandatory, expedited vote in 2½ years, 30 months after implementation of the Gallegly provision, to see the impact of the Gallegly provision on delinquency, on education, and on family life, and then a second vote at the end of 5 years, 60 months. I felt that the Gallegly amendment would, if presented in isolation, be rejected by the Congress, and that we would not deny education to children in this country regardless of the status of their parents. But I believe, after a lot of deliberation, the issue has been resolved.

I am looking forward to the conference which will start in just a few minutes in which we will delete the Gallegly amendment so that the States will not have the option to deny education to children regardless of their parents' status. We can bring this immigration reform bill to the floor, and we can pass it and, I think, have it signed into law.

I thank the Chair. In the absence of any other Senator, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MR. PEROT AND THE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on the decision to exclude Mr. Perot from the upcoming Presidential debates. I want to make it clear from the outset that I support my President and I support my party, but I do believe that Mr. Perot ought to be included in these debates. After all, Mr. Perot and his party have now qualified to be on the ballot in all 50 States in this Nation. He has become eligible for Federal funding. In fact, he will receive nearly \$30 million in Federal funding, based on his previous performance. Last election he received nearly 20 percent of the vote nationwide, and some exit polls indicate he would have done even better if people had not already made the judgment that he could not win. In polling that has been done this year, 76 percent of the American people have indicated they would like to see him included.

I think, for all of those reasons, Mr. Perot deserves to be included. But I think there are other reasons as well. I think Mr. Perot has made a significant contribution to the national debate and discussion over deficit reduction. Frankly, if you go back to the 1992 debates and the 1992 campaign, Mr. Perot can rightfully claim that he served as a prod to both parties to discuss deficit reduction. I believe that remains one of

the foremost challenges this country faces. Mr. Perot would help the debate, in terms of a focus on deficit reduction.

Mr. Perot has also made a contribution in two other areas that have received very little attention during this Presidential campaign. First, with respect to the question of trade, he has a different view than either the Republican challenger, Mr. Dole, or the incumbent President, President Clinton. This country deserves a debate and discussion on trade policy as part of this Presidential campaign.

Finally, I think Mr. Perot has also made a contribution with respect to the question of campaign finance reform. We have heard virtually nothing in this campaign about campaign finance reform.

I hope the Presidential commission will review their decision and decide to include Mr. Perot. Again, I emphasize, I am not a Perot supporter. I do not intend to vote for him for President of the United States. I intend to support the President. I intend to support my party. I think the President has an outstanding record in terms of actually delivering on deficit reduction.

I recall very well, when the President came in, in 1992, he inherited a budget deficit of \$290 billion. That has now been reduced, by the best estimate for this year, to \$116 billion, about a 60-percent reduction. In fact, the deficit has come down every year for 4 years in a row.

Partly because of the Clinton economic plan that was passed in 1993—that was a deficit reduction plan—I believe we have seen the resurgence of this economy. We have become the most competitive nation in the world, replacing Japan. Not only have we seen a dramatic reduction in the deficit, but we have seen a significant strengthening of economic growth. We have had the strongest private sector economic growth on this President's watch than on that of the last three Presidents. We have also seen the lowest misery index—the measure of inflation and unemployment—in 28 years. Business investment is increasing at a rate that is the highest in 30 years. We have seen the creation of more than 10 million new jobs during this President's term.

I think this President has an outstanding record to take before the American people. But I think most of us also know that the job is not finished. The job is not yet completed. More needs to be done. I do believe Mr. Perot would play a positive role in putting a focus on the additional deficit reduction that needs to be made in this country.

As I have stated, I also believe he would make a positive contribution to a debate on trade policy and with respect to the question of campaign finance reform. I am sure the occupant of the chair may share these views. Or perhaps not.

I do think the commission's decision is fatally flawed. When they make a determination that somebody not be in-

cluded because they have no realistic chance of winning, what are they going to do when one of the two major candidates has no realistic prospect of winning? We have had several Presidential campaigns where that was the case. Let's go back to the 1984 Presidential race with Ronald Reagan as the incumbent President. There was no realistic chance anybody was going to beat him. Should we have canceled the Presidential debates altogether?

This year we see the challenger 17 points behind. Nobody has ever made up that kind of gap. Should the Presidential commission determine Mr. Dole has no realistic chance of winning the election, and therefore cancel the debates? The logic used by the commission—that because somebody does not have a realistic prospect of winning the election they should be excluded from the debates—is a slippery slope.

We ought to include those who have met the tests that Mr. Perot has met. I understand Mr. Perot is a controversial figure. His 1992 Presidential campaign—with his entrance into the race, his withdrawal, and his reentrance—raised many questions. But we are still left with some basic facts.

First, he has qualified to be on the ballot in all 50 States. He has done that. His party has qualified to be on the ballot in every State in the Nation.

Second, he has become eligible for Federal matching funds. The only people who have managed to do that this year are Bill Clinton, Bob Dole, and Ross Perot. Nobody else has qualified to get Federal matching funds.

Third, he received nearly 20 percent of the national vote in the last election. I think that merits inclusion in these debates. Finally, perhaps most important, the vast majority of the American people, according to the polls, want him included. They want to hear a debate that includes Mr. Perot. It does not mean they want to vote for him necessarily, but they want to see him included in the debate.

As I have said before, I think he has demonstrated he has made a positive contribution on the issues of deficit reduction, trade, and campaign finance reform.

So, I hope the Presidential commission will review their decision and decide to include Mr. Perot without having a court have to review this decision for them.

I thank the Chair, yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator's thoughtful comments are well received, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for not to exceed 10 minutes.